

1
2 HONORABLE THOMAS S. ZILLY
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

18
19 VERISIGN, INC.,
20
21 Plaintiff,
22
23 v.
24
25 XYZ.com, LLC, and DANIEL
26 NEGARI,
27 Defendants.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

Case No. 2:15-cv-00871-TSZ

Subpoena Relating to Civil Action No. 1:14-CV-01749 (Pending in United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia)

**NONPARTY DONUTS INC.'S
OPPOSITION TO VERISIGN'S MOTION
FOR RECONSIDERATION AND
RENEWED MOTION FOR RULING ON
DEFERRED ISSUES RAISED IN ITS
MOTION TO QUASH**

ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTED

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

Donuts Inc.'s Opposition to Motion for
Reconsideration

77257-0072/LEGAL126910419.1

Perkins Coie LLP
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4900
Seattle, WA 98101-3099
Phone: 206.359.8000
Fax: 206.359.9000

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page	
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	ARGUMENT	1
	A. Verisign Fails to Meet the Standard Applicable to Motions for Reconsideration.....	1
	B. The Court Should Grant Donuts' Motion to Quash on the Deferred Issues	4
III.	CONCLUSION.....	6

1
2
3 **I. INTRODUCTION**
4
5

6 Nonparty Donuts Inc. (“Donuts”) respectfully asks the Court to deny Verisign, Inc.’s
7 (“Verisign”) Motion for Reconsideration. The only basis Verisign asserts for reconsideration is
8 the discovery of allegedly “new facts” in the form of one e-mail string. But the communications
9 in that e-mail are plainly irrelevant to Verisign’s claims and provide no basis for the Court to
10 revisit its prior decision quashing in part Verisign’s subpoena to Donuts.
11
12

13 Additionally, Donuts respectfully requests that the Court use this opportunity to rule on
14 the deferred issues left open in the Court’s previous order. Specifically, Donuts asks that the
15 Court quash the portions of Verisign’s subpoena seeking communications between Donuts and
16 Defendants in the underlying matter because Verisign now acknowledges that it has received
17 these same communications *from Defendants* in the underlying matter and has withdrawn its
18 motion in the Eastern District of Virginia to compel production of these same documents. This
19 reinforces Donuts’ overarching basis for its Motion to Quash, *i.e.*, that a third party should not be
20 burdened by discovery of information available through discovery (and in this instance already
21 produced) in the underlying litigation.
22
23

24 Donuts therefore asks that Verisign’s Motion for Reconsideration be denied and this
25 matter in all other respects be closed.
26
27

28 **II. ARGUMENT**
29
30

31 **A. Verisign Fails to Meet the Standard Applicable to Motions for Reconsideration**
32
33

34 Motions for reconsideration are disfavored and will ordinarily be denied unless there was
35 a manifest error in the prior ruling or new facts or legal authority that could not have been
36 brought to the court’s attention earlier with reasonable diligence. LCR 7(h). Verisign does not
37 contend that the Court committed manifest error or that Verisign discovered new legal authority
38 bearing on the Court’s prior ruling. Mot. to Reconsider at 2. Instead, Verisign’s sole basis for
39 seeking reconsideration is its discovery of purported “new facts” since the Court’s ruling. *See id.*
40
41

1
2 But the supposedly “new” facts consist of a single e-mail string that occurred well after the
3 commencement of the underlying litigation and that has no bearing on the Court’s order
4 quashing in part Verisign’s subpoena.
5
6

7 By way of background, Verisign’s subpoena that was the subject of the Court’s June 15,
8 2015 Order sought Donuts’ internal documents relating to a National Public Radio (“NPR”)
9 interview that aired in April 2014 in which one of Donuts’ employees, Daniel Schindler, spoke
10 exclusively about Donuts’ business model and **not** about Verisign, the .COM top-level domain,
11 or the availability of domain names in the .COM top-level domain. After full briefing, this Court
12 correctly held that “VeriSign, Inc. has made no showing that the materials sought are
13 nonprivileged and either relevant or ‘reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible
14 evidence.’” Order at ¶ 2(a) (citation omitted). Indeed, as described at length in Donuts’ Reply
15 Motion (Dkt. 9 at 4-5, 11-13), Verisign’s stated rationales as to why Donuts’ internal documents
16 are relevant have continued to change. They have changed from the non-existent (when Verisign
17 could provide no rationale during the meet and confer), *id.* at 11, to the speculative and
18 unsupported (when Verisign asserted that Donuts “likely . . . vetted [Negari’s] speaking points”
19 prior to the NPR interview), *id.*, to the truly incoherent (when Verisign asserted that Donuts’
20 internal documents would shed light on “whether and to what extent XYZ influenced or caused
21 *Donuts’ publication* of these falsehoods,” *id.* (citation omitted) (emphasis added)).
22
23

24 Now, Verisign burdens this Court with yet another reason as to why Donuts’ internal
25 documents are relevant: because the email string shows that there *must* be internal Donuts
26 documents that “provide unique evidence of Negari’s state of mind” at the time that Negari made
27 “false statements” about Verisign and the .COM top-level domain. Mot. to Reconsider at 4. But
28 contrary to the stated rationale in the Reconsideration Motion, the e-mail string is not relevant
29 either to the Court’s order or to additional discovery being sought for three critical reasons.
30
31

- 32 • ***First***, the e-mail has nothing to do with the object of the subpoena request itself,
33 namely the NPR interview. Rather, the e-mail, which was produced by the

1
2 underlying Defendant XYZ, concerns not the NPR interview but the litigation
3 itself.
4
5

- 6 • **Second**, the e-mail exchange took place in March 2015, almost a year after the
7 NPR interview with Negari aired in April 2014, and months after the litigation
8 commenced. Thus, contrary to Verisign's contentions, the e-mail cannot be
9 relevant to "Negari's state of mind at the time of his false representations [at the
10 NPR interview], including whether Negari knew that the statements were false
11 when he made them." Mot. to Reconsider at 2. It goes without saying that a
12 communication that occurred over a year after an interview does not reflect the
13 interviewee's contemporaneous state of mind during that interview.
14
15 • **Third**, Mr. Negari exchanged this e-mail with Mr. Stahura, not with Mr.
16 Schindler. This discrepancy is important. Mr. Schindler is the Donuts employee
17 who participated in the NPR interview and about whom Verisign is seeking
18 discovery through its subpoena to Donuts, not Mr. Stahura. *See* Verisign's
19
20 Opposition to Donuts' Motion to Quash, Dkt. 7 at 8-9 (Verisign claiming it needs
21 documents from Donuts because "[g]iven Schindler's position in the industry and
22 involvement in the radio program, his communications regarding Negari's
23 statements may provide valuable insight into Negari's intent . . ."). Even
24 assuming, *arguendo*, that Verisign's claim that Mr. Schindler's email
25 communications somehow shed light on Mr. Negari's intent, *see id.* (which itself
26 strains credulity), it would not follow that the discovery of a single e-mail sent by
27 Mr. Stahura, unrelated to and so long after the NPR interview, somehow means
28 there must be communications by Mr. Schindler about the NPR interview or the
29 availability of .COM domain names. Verisign's argument simply makes no
30 sense.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

Lacking a sound basis for its assertion that the e-mail is relevant to requests stated in its subpoena, Verisign instead presents an extreme and baseless conspiracy theory, *i.e.*: that the e-mail shows that Donuts and Defendants are working in concert to obstruct Verisign's discovery efforts—discovery efforts subjected to motions already decided on the merits by Courts in two federal districts. Mot. to Reconsider at 1. Verisign presents no evidence of Donuts' (a) intent to obstruct discovery, or (b) ability to do that. Verisign's suggestion is based on a tortured characterization of the single e-mail exchange that on its face reflects banter between two people in the same industry making a facetious remark regarding what Mr. Stahura views as a baseless lawsuit.

Moreover, Mr. Stahura's personal view in March 2015 on the lack of merit in Verisign's lawsuit is far afield from any relevance to a third party subpoena demanding documents about an interview that took place a year prior. The bottom line is this: Donuts (and anyone for that matter) is allowed to opine on what it views as a meritless lawsuit. Doing so should not expose these third parties to baseless subpoenas issued for an invalid purpose (*i.e.*, to double check the completeness of a party's document productions).

And finally, the topic of any personal views provided by Mr. Stahura to Mr. Negari about why he believed Verisign's lawsuit lacked merit is unrelated to Verisign's unsupported accusation that Donuts is ignoring or working to subvert anyone's discovery obligations—either its own (in the form of this Court's June 15 Order), or those of Defendants in the underlying suit.

In sum, Verisign fails to demonstrate any “new facts” warranting reconsideration of the Court's order granting in part Donuts' motion to quash the subpoena. The e-mail is neither relevant to the underlying litigation nor evidence of a nonexistent, secret conspiracy in the underlying litigation. Mot. to Reconsider at 4. The Court should deny Verisign's Motion for Reconsideration.

1
2 **B. The Court Should Grant Donuts' Motion to Quash on the Deferred Issues**

3
4 The Court previously deferred ruling on the portions of the subpoena seeking
5 communications between Defendants and Donuts until resolution of two discovery motions
6 pending in the Eastern District of Virginia. Minute Order at ¶(2)(c). Both motions have been
7 resolved since entry of the Court's order. *See VeriSign, Inc. v. XYZ.COM LLC*, No. 1:14-CV-
8 01749 (E.D. Va.), ECF Nos. 79-81. Regarding the first motion, Verisign received production
9 from Defendants on the same subject matter for which it seeks discovery from Donuts and
10 consequently withdrew its motion to compel. *See id.*, ECF Nos. 80, 81; Mot. to Reconsider at 2
11 n.2, 5. Regarding the second motion, the Eastern District of Virginia granted XYZ's motion to
12 compel in part and ordered Verisign to produce responsive documents within three weeks of the
13 order. *See id.*, ECF Nos. 79, 81.

14
15 Having received the documents it seeks from Defendants (after apparently dragging its
16 feet with respect to its own discovery obligations), Verisign still seeks to burden Donuts by
17 asking for duplicative information already in its possession. Verisign claims it is "concerned"
18 that XYZ's production is deficient, but Verisign appears to have consistently misrepresented the
19 state of discovery in the underlying litigation and attempted to paint Defendants as bad actors
20 who are willfully flouting their discovery obligations and refusing to produce documents at every
21 turn. *E.g.*, Verisign, Inc.'s Motion to Transfer Donuts Inc.'s Motion to Quash, Dkt. 7 at 5. This
22 portrayal has proven to be false as Defendants apparently have complied with their discovery
23 obligations and produced substantial volumes of responsive documents—a fact that even
24 Verisign admits. Mot. to Reconsider at 2 n.2, 5. And Verisign's claims about Defendants'
25 purported discovery deficiencies are simply not credible in light of the fact that Verisign has
26 itself failed in its own discovery obligations resulting in the Virginia court ordering Verisign to
27 produce documents on a rolling basis in response to a motion to compel brought by Defendants.
28
29

30 Because Verisign can no longer credibly complain that Defendants are not producing
31 documents, instead, Verisign raises an irrelevant issue regarding Negari's purportedly "evasive"

32
33 Donuts Inc.'s Opposition to Motion for
34 Reconsideration – 5

35
36 77257-0072/LEGAL126910419.1

37
38 Perkins Coie LLP
39 1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4900
40 Seattle, WA 98101-3099
41 Phone: 206.359.8000
42 Fax: 206.359.9000

1
2 answers during a deposition. Mot. to Reconsider at 5. But Verisign does not claim that the
3 questions and answers related to the topic of Mr. Negari's communications with Donuts (in fact,
4 the excerpted hearing transcript attached as Exhibit 2 to DePalma's Affidavit suggests
5 otherwise). And Verisign does not explain how Mr. Negari's deposition bears on nonparty
6 Donuts' discovery obligations.
7
8

9 Ultimately, Verisign offers no justification as to why Donuts should be burdened in
10 producing duplicative information. And as Donuts argued in its opening Motion to Quash and
11 Reply, Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 45 does not allow a party to compel production from a
12 nonparty to "double check" the completeness of another party's production. Donuts respectfully
13 asks the Court to rule on the deferred issues and grant Donuts' motion to quash those portions of
14 the subpoena seeking information duplicative of that sought, and at this point, obtained from
15 Defendants in the underlying litigation.
16
17

26 III. CONCLUSION

27 For the foregoing reasons, Donuts respectfully requests that the Court deny Verisign's
28 motion for reconsideration and grant Donuts' motion to quash on the deferred issues.
29
30

31 DATED: July 20, 2015.

s/Thomas L. Boeder

32 Thomas L. Boeder, WSBA #408
33 TBoeder@perkinscoie.com
34 Elvira Castillo, WSBA #43893
35 ECastillo@perkinscoie.com
36 **Perkins Coie LLP**
37 1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4800
38 Seattle, WA 98101-3099
39 Telephone: 206.359.8000
40 Facsimile: 206.359.9000
41
42
43
44
45

46 Attorneys for Nonparty Donuts Inc.
47
48
49
50
51

1
2 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**
3
4

5 Elvira Castillo certifies and states:
6
7

8 I certify that on July 20, 2015, I electronically filed the foregoing document with the
9 Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system, which will send notification of such filing to all
10 attorneys of record, and caused said document to be served on the attorneys of record listed
11 below by regular U.S. mail, postage prepaid:
12
13

14 Jenny A. Durkan
15 Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan LLP
16 600 University Street, Suite 2800
17 Seattle, WA 98101
18
19

20 David M. Orta
21 Mike Bonnano
22 Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan LLP
23 777 6th Street, NW, 11th Floor
24 Washington, D.C. 20001
25
26

27 Counsel to Plaintiff Verisign, Inc.
28
29

30 Derek A. Newman
31 Derek Linke
32 Newman Du Wors LLP
33 2101 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1500
34 Seattle, WA 98121
35
36

37 Counsel to Defendants XYZ.COM, LLC and Daniel Negari
38
39

40 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America and of
41 the state of Washington that the foregoing is true and correct.
42
43

44 EXECUTED at Seattle, Washington on July 20, 2015.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 *s/ Elvira Castillo, WSBA No. 43893*
53 Attorneys for Non-party Donuts Inc.
54 **Perkins Coie LLP**
55 1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4900
56 Seattle, WA 98101-3099
57 Telephone: 206.359.8000
58 Facsimile: 206.359.9000
59 Email: ECastillo@perkinscoie.com